

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/998,386

11/15/2001

Joe Nathan Brown

AUS920010875US1

7328

7590

09/08/2004

Mr. Volel Emile
P.O. Box 202170
Austin, TX 78720-2170

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/998,386		BROWN ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Maikhanh Nguyen		2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communication: original application filed 11/15/2001.
2. Claims 1-44 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 11-12, 22-23, 33-34, and 44 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: "the method of claim 6" (claim 4, line 6) should probably read "the method of claim 2." Appropriate correction is required.

Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 12, 23, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Nielsen** (U.S. 6,021,435 – issued 02/2000).

As to independent claim 1, Nielsen teaches a method of making links a displayed Web document clearly recognizable comprising the steps of:

- displaying the Web document (*e.g., retrieves a web page ... and displays it; col.4, lines 34-48*); and

- highlighting the links if they are easily not easily identifiable in the displayed Web document (*e.g., all of the link anchors 202 are shown as underlined text. Most of the link anchors 202 are depicted in blue type as distinct from the default text color, black. A particular link anchor 204 is shown in violet to indicate that it points to a web site that has already been visited; col.3, lines 41-53 / highlights text link anchors by underlining the text and displaying it in a special color different from the default text color; col.4, lines 34-48*).

As to independent claim 12, it is directed to a computer program product for implementing the method of claim 1, is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 23, it is directed to an apparatus for performing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 34, it is directed to a computer system for performing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale. Additionally, claim 33 further recites “memory device and processor”.

Nielsen teaches memory device (*a system memory 16; col.2, lines 63-64 and Fig.1A*) and processor (*a central processor 14; col.2, line 64 and Fig.1A*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-11, 13-22, 24-33, and 35-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Nielsen** in view of **DeStefano** (U.S. 6,184, 885 – field 03/1998).

As to dependent claim 2, Nielsen does teach “the highlighting step”, but is silent on “performed by a user.”

DeStefano teaches performing by a user (*col. 19, lines 11-23 and Fig. 7*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from DeStefano in the system of Nielsen because it would have provided the capability for facilitating the control of highlighting the URLs displaying in the HTML document.

As to dependent claim 3, Nielsen does not explicitly teach “having the link flash.”

DeStefano teaches having the link flash (*col.24, lines 19-28*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from DeStefano in the system of Nielsen because it would have provided the capability for visually distinguish highlighting information from unhighlighted information.

As to dependent claim 4, Nielsen teaches displaying the links in a different color (*e.g., displaying it in a special color different from the default text color; col.4, lines 40-42*).

As to dependent claim 5, Nielsen teaches displaying the links using a larger font (*Fig.3*).

As to dependent claim 6, Nielsen teaches displaying the links using a different font (*Fig.3*).

As to dependent claim 7, Nielsen teaches emboldening the links (*e.g., the link anchors are depicted in a blue type; col.3, lines 46-49*).

As to dependent claim 8, Nielsen teaches enlarging the font used to display the links including the links target area (*Fig.3*).

As to dependent claim 9, Nielsen teaches duplicating the links and displaying the duplicated links in a different area (*col.5, lines 24-45*).

As to dependent claim 10, Nielsen teaches when a duplicated link is selected, its corresponding link in the web document flashes or is emboldened or is displayed in a different color or is displayed using a different font or a larger font (*Fig.3; col.3, lines 46-51; and col.4, lines 37-42*).

As to independent claim 11, the rejection of independent claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. However, claim 11 further recites “highlighting the links is performed by a user.”

Nielsen does teach highlighting the links, but is silent on “performed by a user.”

DeStefano teaches performing by a user (*col. 19, lines 11-23 and Fig. 7*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from DeStefano in the system of Nielsen because it would have provided the capability for facilitating the control of highlighting the URLs displaying in the HTML document.

As to dependent claims 13-21, they include the same limitations as in claims 2-10, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 22, it is directed to a computer program product for implementing the method of claim 11, is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 24-32, they include the same limitations as in claims 2-10, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 33, it is directed to an apparatus for performing the method of claim 11, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 35-43, they include the same limitations as in claims 2-10, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 44, it is directed to a computer system for performing the method of claim 11, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Nielsen teaches memory device (*a system memory 16; col.2, lines 63-64 and Fig.1A*) and processor (*a central processor 14; col.2, line 64 and Fig.1A*).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Becker et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,878,223	issued: Mar. 2, 1999
Horvitz	U.S. Patent No. 6,182,133	issued: Jan. 30, 2001
Bates et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,222,541	issued: Apr. 24, 2001
Sundaresan et al.	U.S. Patent Pub. 2002/0129114	published: Sep. 12, 2002
Davis-Hall	U.S. Patent No. 6,601,066	issued: Jul. 29, 2003

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-0092. After mid-October, 2004, the examiner can be reached at (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792.


Application/Control Number: 09/998,386
Art Unit: 2176

Page 7

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen
September 1, 2004



SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER